

I selected the membership of it, and it wasn't intended to be something that was balanced and having a situation where a majority vote would occur. We had an imbalanced task force, heavily weighted toward those who were agencies with concerns, and we tried to see if we could work through and address some of those concerns. But the agencies were adamant in terms of their feeling that they wanted not change until forced to change and were not really willing to consider alternatives or to offer alternatives. So if you go to the task force and say, well the task force couldn't reach a conclusion, well it didn't bother me and I formed the task force. It seemed to me that we were trying to address the problem in a way that some groups are just not willing to make any changes in. And I think it's to their own loss and detriment, because in the end they are burying their head in the sand on what is happening in judicial process across the country and is going to happen in Nebraska sometime, I believe, in the near future. So I have great fondness and respect for the adoption agencies, they do wonderful work. But in this particular instance they are set in the ways in which they do things, and simply are unwilling to consider the environment we're in today and look at alternatives. They have not offered reasonable alternatives that have been seriously presented that could deal with the problem, and so they have not, in a constructive fashion, helped us move forward on this issue. On the other hand, others involved in the adoption process, a number of attorneys and others who...adopting parents, for instance, have really come forward and worked very hard on this proposal and I think have developed it very carefully. Now, Senator Bromm was talking about and others have talked about, well we don't want to help these fathers, we don't...we think this bill does too much for the fathers. And the fathers came in and testified in opposition to it because they didn't think it did enough to them...for them. They thought it was harmful to them. It's not intended to be harmful to them because in the end it gives them notice, and that is something that they should have a right to. But it also makes it hard for them to intervene and to gain custody of a child, the best interests of the child, as Senator Matzke has talked about, is placed in there. So this is one of those issues where nobody is completely happy with it because we've tried to balance it out. But in the end it will meet a constitutional test, in my view, and a fairness test, in my view, of how we should deal with a very sticky and difficult issue that has arisen across the country and has, as well, arisen here and will again in the future. So again, I encourage you...oh, Senator